arXiv:1701.06860v2 [math.DG] 8 Feb 2017

ON DOMAINS BIHOLOMORPHIC TO TEICHMÜLLER SPACES

SUBHOJOY GUPTA AND HARISH SESHADRI

Abstract. We prove certain restrictions on the geometry of any bounded domain that is biholomorphic to the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$ of a closed surface of genus ≥ 2. In particular, we show that such a domain cannot be strictly convex. This will follow from a more general result where we relax the hypothesis on strict convexity and require this condition only locally. We also provide a new proof of the fact that a Teichmüller space of a closed surface of genus ≥ 2 cannot be realized as a bounded domain with C^2-smooth boundary.

1. Introduction

A classical result of L. Bers asserts that the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$ of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ can be realized as a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$. While it is known that $\mathcal{T}$, endowed with the complex structure induced by this embedding, is pseudoconvex (see for example [Kru91], [Yeu03], [Shi84]), there is only a partial understanding of the biholomorphism-type of $\mathcal{T}$. In particular, the following is a folklore conjecture, widely believed to be true:

Conjecture 1. *The Teichmüller space of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ cannot be biholomorphic to a bounded convex domain.*

The fact that the image of the Bers embedding is not convex is a result of K.T. Kim in [Kim04] (see also [Kru95]). In this paper we address the finer question of *local convexity* at individual boundary points. We say that a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is locally convex at $p \in \partial\Omega$ if $\Omega \cap B(p, r)$ is convex for some $r > 0$. We raise the following stronger conjecture:

Conjecture 2. *The Teichmüller space of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ cannot be biholomorphic to a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ that is locally convex at some boundary point.*

Our main result proves this under some additional hypotheses on the boundary point under consideration. In what follows, a boundary point $p \in \partial\Omega$ where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is *smooth* if it is "twice differentiable" in the sense of Alexandroff (see Definition 2.7); such points have full measure if Ω is convex.

Theorem 1.1 (Main result)**.** *The Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$ of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ cannot be biholomorphic to a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ that has a smooth point $p \in \partial\Omega$ with the following properties:*

- *the domain Ω is locally convex at p,*
- *there is a supporting hyperplane V for Ω at p such that $\mathcal{O} = \partial\Omega \cap V$ is a convex set, and*
- *the boundary point p is a complex extreme point of $\mathcal{O}$, that is, the only vector $y \in \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ such that the affine disk $\{p + \tau y | \tau \in \Delta\} \subset \mathcal{O}$ is $y = 0$.*

As an immediate corollary to our main result, we have the following special case of Conjecture 1. Recall that a convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ (for some N) is said to be strictly convex if $\partial\Omega$ does not contain any line segment.

Corollary 1.2. *A Teichmüller space of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ cannot be biholomorphic to any strictly convex domain.*

As an application of Theorem 1.1, we give a new proof of the following result of S-T. Yau:

Theorem 1.3. *The Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$ of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$ cannot be biholomorphic to a bounded domain with C^2-smooth boundary.*

It is a remarkable feature of Teichmüller space that its complex geometry has many similarities with those of bounded convex domains (see [AP99]). These include the fact that complex geodesics in $\mathcal{T}$ are abundant (true for convex domains by work of L. Lempert [Lem81]), as well as the fact that embeddings of totally geodesic discs are holomorphic or anti-holomorphic, proved for strongly convex domains in [GS13] and more recently for strictly convex domains in [Ant14]. This might make Conjecture 1, and the results of the paper, seem somewhat surprising.

However, as described in S-T. Siu's survey [Siu91], Conjecture 1 fits in the context of the work of S. Frankel ([Fra89]) who proves that any bounded convex domain with a cocompact group of automorphisms must be biholomorphic to a bounded symmetric domain. A basic fact regarding Teichmüller spaces is H. Royden's result that though $\mathcal{T}$ is not a symmetric domain, it has a discrete automorphism group, namely the mapping class group of the genus-g surface (see [Roy71], and the discussion in §2.1). The quotient $\mathcal{T}/Aut(\mathcal{T})$, which is the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_g$, is noncompact, though with finite Kobayashi volume. It is this non-compactness of the quotient that is the main difficulty: a generalization of Frankel's result to the case of convex domain with a finite-volume quotient is not known. Otherwise Conjecture 1 would have followed from Frankel's result, and Theorem 1.3 would have been a consequence of the following easy corollary of a theorem of Wong-Rosay ([Won77], [Ros79]):

If Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^N$ with C^2-smooth boundary such that the action of $Aut(\Omega)$ on Ω is co-compact, then Ω is biholomorphic to the unit ball.

In his work Frankel introduced a rescaling technique along an orbit of the automorphism group accumulating at a boundary point. Though the technique

of boundary localization has a long history in the study of multivariable complex analysis (as pioneered by S. Pinchuk [Pin91]), a striking feature of Frankel's method is that it dispenses with the assumption of C^2-smoothness of the boundary. In contrast, most of the work in the study of complex domains with discrete non-compact automorphism groups involves such an assumption (as in the work of Wong and Rosay mentioned above).

Subsequent to Frankel's work, it was realized by Kim-Krantz ([KK08]) that Pinchuk's rescaling technique can be adapted to work in the nonsmooth boundary case if the domain is also assumed to be convex. In [Kim04] Kim uses this technique to show that the the image of the Bers embedding is not convex. The reason for not using Frankel's technique directly is that Kim's argument involves the existence of an automorphism orbit converging *nontangentially* to a boundary point. This is guaranteed if the action is co-compact, and not known to always hold in the finite co-volume case. A crucial step in Kim's work is to show that the accumulation points of orbits of the mapping class group is dense in the Bers boundary. This relies on McMullen's result that "cusps are dense" there ([McM91]) which is specific to the Bers embedding.

The strategy of our proof of Theorem 1.1 is to essentially show that if there is such realization Ω of $\mathcal{T}$, the smooth complex extreme point in $\partial\Omega$ is an accumulation point of a mapping class group orbit. This then yields a contradiction by the standard rescaling argument due to Kim-Krantz-Pinchuk and the discreteness of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{T})$.

We use the following two key facts from Teichmüller theory (see §2.1 for definitions and precise statements):

First, the abundance of holomorphic *Teichmüller disks* in $\mathcal{T}$ that are both totally geodesic in the Teichmüller metric, and complex geodesics in the Kobayashi metric; the two metrics coincide by the work of H. Royden in [Roy71].

Second, the ergodicity of the Teichmüller geodesic flow due to H. Masur [Mas82] and W. Veech [Vee82] whose work implies, in particular, that for any Teichmüller disk, almost every radial direction is a geodesic ray that projects to a dense set in $\mathcal{M}_g$. In particular, there is a sequence of points along such rays that recur to any fixed compact set in $\mathcal{M}_g$.

These facts are used together with a construction of a pluriharmonic "barrier" function that helps in trapping such a recurrent sequence to an arbitrary neighborhood of the complex extreme boundary point. A comparison of Kobayashi and Euclidean distances then shows that there is in fact a mapping class group orbit that shadows the sequence and accumulates to the same point.

Note. After the first draft of the this paper was circulated, we came to know of a recent preprint of V. Markovic [Mar] where it is proved that Kobayashi and Caratheodory metrics are not equal on $\mathcal{T}$. By a result of L. Lempert this implies Conjecture 1. It also implies, using localization results of the Kobayashi and

Caratheodory metric (see, for example, [Nik02]) and the techniques of this paper, that there are no C^∞-smooth orbit accumulation points on the boundary that are locally convex. However, this assumption of C^∞-smoothness is crucial, and our main result (Theorem 1.1) does not follow, to the best of our knowledge, from the work of Markovic.

Plan of the paper. In §2 we briefly describe some background and results that we use in later sections. For ease of exposition, we consider the case of a strictly-convex domain in §3, and provide a proof of Corollary 1.2 directly, in which case the pluriharmonic barrier function at a smooth boundary point mentioned above, is simply the "height" from the supporting hyperplane. We then turn to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in §4, which involves an inductive construction of the barrier function. Finally in §5, we provide the proof of Theorem 1.3 as an application of our main result.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Gautam Bharali for many illuminating conversations. The first author thanks the hospitality and support of the center of excellence grant 'Center for Quantum Geometry of Moduli Spaces' from the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF95) during May-June 2016. He wishes to acknowledge that the research leading to these results was supported by a Marie Curie International Research Staff Exchange Scheme Fellowship within the 7th European Union Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 612534, project MODULI - Indo European Collaboration on Moduli Spaces.

2. Preliminaries

Notation. We collect notations introduced in Section 1 and others used in the paper:

- $\Delta := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \ : \ |z| = 1\}$
- $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ denotes the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$.
- for $r > 0$, $B(p, r)$ denotes the closed Euclidean ball of radius r and center p.
- $J : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ denotes the standard almost complex structure.

Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^N$ and $p \in \partial\Omega$:

- If p is a differentiable point, $T_p(\partial\Omega)$ denotes the tangent space to $\partial\Omega$ at p.
- For a general point p, V_p denotes a supporting hyperplane at p.
- $\mathcal{O}_p := \partial\Omega \cap V_p$. We shall assume this is a convex set.
- if $\mathcal{O}_p$ is convex then it is the closure of an open subset of a subspace of V_p. This subspace is denoted by W_p.

2.1. **Teichmüller space and Teichmüller disks.** We briefly recall some basic facts and definitions in Teichmüller theory that shall be relevant to this paper; see [Leh87], [Ahl06], [Hub06] for further details and references.

For a closed surface S of genus $g \geq 2$, the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$ is the space of marked Riemann surfaces:

$$\mathcal{T} = \{(f, X) |\ X \text{ is a Riemann surface and } f : S \to X \text{ is a homeomorphism}\}/\sim$$

where $(f, X) \sim (g, Y)$ if there is a biholomorphism $h : X \to Y$ that is homotopic to $g \circ f^{-1}$.

The mapping class group

$$\mathrm{MCG}(S) = \mathrm{Homeo}^+(S)/\mathrm{Homeo}_0^+(S)$$

is the group of orientation-preserving homeomorphisms of S quotiented by the subgroup of those homotopic to the identity. This is a countable group, which is discrete in the topology induced from the compact-open topology on $\mathrm{Homeo}^+(S)$.

The group $\mathrm{MCG}(S)$ acts properly discontinuously on $\mathcal{T}$ by the action $\phi \cdot (f, X) \to (f \circ \phi^{-1}, X)$ and the quotient is the Riemann moduli space $\mathcal{M}_g$. The quotient map thus coincides with the forgetful map $\pi : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{M}_g$ defined by $(f, X) \mapsto X$.

The Teichmüller metric on $\mathcal{T}$ is defined as

$$d_{\mathcal{T}}((f, X), (g, Y)) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_h \ln K(h) \tag{1}$$

where the infimum varies over all quasiconformal homeomorphisms $h : X \to Y$ that are homotopic to $g \circ f^{-1}$, and $K(h)$ is the quasiconformal distortion of the map h.

It is known that

Theorem 2.1 (Royden [Roy71])**.** *The mapping class group* $\mathrm{MCG}(S)$ *is precisely the group of isometries of* $(\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$*.*

Teichmüller in fact showed that the infimum in (1) is achieved by a *Teichmüller map* that is determined by a holomorphic quadratic differential q on X. Such differentials in fact span the cotangent space $T_X^*\mathcal{T}$ to Teichmüller space at the point X, and any point X and direction q determines a *Teichmüller geodesic ray.*

The following results from Teichmüller theory is of crucial importance to this paper.

First, we have:

Theorem 2.2 (Masur [Mas82], Veech [Vee82])**.** *The Teichmüller geodesic flow is ergodic: that is, for almost every* $X \in \mathcal{T}$ *and* $q \in T_X^*\mathcal{T}$*, the projection of the Teichmüller geodesic ray to the cotangent bundle of moduli space* $\mathcal{M}_g$*, equidistributes.*

Second, a *Teichmüller disk* is an isometric embedding

$$\mathcal{D} : (\Delta, \rho_\Delta) \to (\mathcal{T}, d_{\mathcal{T}})$$

which is also holomorphic. Here ρ_Δ is the distance function of the Poinc'are metric on Δ. See for example, §9.5 of [Leh87], for their construction and properties.

Such embeddings are abundant: there is a Teichmüller disk through any given point $X \in \mathcal{T}$ and direction $q \in T^*_X\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, the image of the radial rays $R_\theta = \mathcal{D}(\cdot, \theta)$ for a fixed angle θ are Teichmüller geodesic rays in $\mathcal{T}$.

We shall use the following consequence of the ergodicity of the Teichmüller geodesic flow. In what follows, a Teichmüller geodesic ray is *dense* if its projection to $\mathcal{M}_g$ is a dense set.

Proposition 2.3. *For any basepoint $X \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists a Teichmüller disk $\mathcal{D} : \Delta \to \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{D}(0) = X$, such that any Teichmüller ray $R_\theta \subset D$ is dense for any θ in a full measure set of angles $\Xi \subset [0, 2\pi]$.*

Proof. By the ergodicity theorem, we have that for almost every point $X \in \mathcal{T}$ and almost every direction $q \in T^*_X\mathcal{T}$, the Teichmüller geodesic ray from X in the direction q equidistributes in the tangent bundle $\mathcal{Q} \to \mathcal{T}$, and in particular, projects to a dense set in $\mathcal{M}_g$. From the same work of Masur and Veech, it follows that the subset of *uniquely-ergodic* directions $q \in T^*_X\mathcal{T}$ is of full measure. Moreover, from Theorem 2 of [Mas80] two Teichmüller rays in the same uniquely-ergodic direction are (strongly) asymptotic, and hence at *any* given basepoint X, the set of directions E which yield a dense ray is of full measure.

The unit sphere of directions S^{6g-7} comprising holomorphic quadratic differentials on X of unit norm is foliated by circles corresponding to directions given by Teichmüller disks; by Fubini's theorem almost every such circle will intersect E in a set of full measure. In particular, there exists a Teichmüller disk and a full measure set of directions Ξ such that each corresponding radial ray is dense. □

2.2. **Kobayashi metric and complex geodesics:** The complex structure on Teichmüller space is inherited by the embedding

$$\mathcal{B}_X : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$$

introduced by Bers in [Ber60]. (Though the embedding depends on a choice of a fixed Riemann surface $X \in \mathcal{T}$, varying X produces biholomorphically equivalent domains.)

The image of $\mathcal{B}_X$ is a bounded domain.

On any bounded domain Ω in $\mathbb{C}^N$, the *infinitesimal Kobayashi metric* is defined by the following norm for a tangent vector v at a point $X \in \Omega$:

$$K(X, v) = \inf_{h:\Delta\to\Omega} \frac{|v|}{|h'(0)|} \tag{2}$$

where over all holomorphic maps $h : \Delta \to \Omega$ such that $h(0) = X$ and $h'(0)$ is a multiple of v.

The *Kobayashi metric* d^K on Ω is then the distance defined in the usual way: one first defines lengths of piecewise C^1 curves in Ω using the above norm and

then takes the infimum of lengths of curves joining two given points to get the distance between them.

We list some elementary properties of the Kobayashi metric d^K on a bounded domain Ω in $\mathbb{C}^N$.

Proposition 2.4. *(1) Biholomorphisms of Ω are isometries for d^K.*

(2) If $\Omega \subset \Omega'$ then their respective Kobayashi metrics satisfy $d'_K \leq d_K$ on the smaller domain Ω.

(3) Let d^e denote Euclidean distance on $\mathbb{C}^N$. There exists $C = C(\Omega)$ such that $d^e \leq Cd^K$ on Ω.

Sketch of the proof. (1) and (2) are immediate from the definition (2), and (3) then follows from the comparison obtained by embedding Ω in a round ball of radius C in $\mathbb{C}^N$. □

The Kobayashi metric on the image of the Bers embedding gives rise to the Kobayashi metric d^K on $\mathcal{T}$. The following fundamental result is due to Royden:

Theorem (Royden [Roy71])**.** *The Kobayashi and Teichmüller metrics on $\mathcal{T}$ coincide, that is, we have $d^T = d^K$.*

As a consequence of the Royden's theorem (Theorem 2.1), we then have:

Corollary 2.5. *The group of biholomorphisms of $\mathcal{T}$ is the mapping class group.*

Note that the Teichmüller disks introduced in §2.1 are complex geodesics in the following sense:

Definition 2.6 (Complex geodesic)**.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a bounded domain. A *complex geodesic* in Ω is an isometric, holomorphic embedding $\phi : (\Delta, \rho_\Delta) \to (\Omega, d^K)$, where ρ_Δ denotes the Poincare metric on Δ and d^K is the Kobayashi metric.

2.3. **Convex domains.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex domain. We shall use the following notion of "smoothness" for points in $\partial\Omega$:

Definition 2.7. A boundary point $p \in \partial\Omega$ is *twice differentiable in the sense of Alexandroff* if Ω has a supporting hyperplane V at p, and in a neighborhood U around p the boundary $\partial\Omega \cap U$ is a graph of a (convex) function $\psi : U \cap V \to \mathbb{R}_+$ that has a second order Taylor expansion. That is, if we assume without loss of generality that $p = 0$ and the supporting hyperplane is $V = \{x_n = 0\}$, we have:

$$\psi(x_1, x_2, \dots x_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} H_{i,j} x_i x_j + o(\|x\|^2) \tag{3}$$

for some $n \times n$ symmetric matrix H (which, for a genuine C^2-function, is the Hessian).

Remark. It is a result of Alexandroff in [Ale39] (see also [BCP96]) that for a convex domain Ω, almost every boundary point is smooth in the above sense.

A property that will be crucial in later section is:

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded convex domain, and $p \in \partial\Omega$ be smooth in the sense defined above. Then p has an interior sphere contact, namely there is a round sphere S contained in $\bar{\Omega}$ such that $S \cap \bar{\Omega} = \{p\}$.*

Proof. As in Definition 2.7, we can assume that $p = 0$ and the supporting hyperplane is $V = \{x_n = 0\}$. Let $\psi : U \cap V \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be convex defining function for the domain in a neighborhood of the boundary point p, such that ψ has a second order Taylor expansion as in (3). Then it is then easy to check that for any $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2\|H\|}$, the sphere S centered at $(0, 0, \ldots, 0, \epsilon)$ and radius ϵ lies above the graph defined by (3) and is thus contained in Ω. □

2.4. **Kim-Krantz-Pinchuk Rescaling.** Let Ω be a bounded domain that is *locally convex* at a smooth boundary point, that is, there exists $q \in \partial\Omega$ such that a neighborhood $B(q, r) \cap \Omega$ is convex. Note that we do not assume Ω is globally convex; we shall need this weaker assumption on the domain in §5.

Let $\{p_j\}_{j\geq 1} \in D$ be a sequence converging to q. For each j let $q_j \in \partial\Omega$ be the closest boundary point, with

$$\|p_j - q_j\| = \inf_{x\in\partial\Omega} \|p_j - x\|.$$

We can find a unitary transformation $T_j : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^N$ such that the affine map $\psi_j : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^N$ defined by $\psi_j(z) = T_j(z - p_j)$ satisfies

$$\psi_j(\Omega) \subset \{(z_1, ..., z_n) \ : \ Re(z_n) > 0\}.$$

Denote by V^j_{n-1} the orthogonal complement in $\mathbb{C}^N$ of the line joining the origin and $\psi_j(q_j)$ and let D^j_{n-1} be the projected slice

$$D^j_{n-1} = \{z \in V^j_{n-1} \ : |z + \psi_j(q_j) \in \psi_j(\Omega)\}.$$

Note that D^j_{n-1} is a domain in V^j_{n-1} containing the origin. Let x^j_{n-1} be a point in ∂D^j_{n-1} closest to the origin. Let V^j_{n-2} denote the orthogonal complement in V^j_{n-1} of the line spanned by x^j_{n-1} and let

$$D^j_{n-2} = D^j_{n-1} \cap V^j_{n-2}.$$

We continue this process as long as it is possible to do so.

By this process we obtain mutually orthogonal vectors $x^j_1, ..., x^j_{n-1}$. Then the vectors

$$e^j_l = \frac{x^j_l}{\|x^j_l\|}$$

form an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{C}^N$. For each j define the complex linear mapping

$$\Lambda_l^j(x_l^j) = e_l^j, \qquad l = 1, 2, ..., n.$$

Definition 2.9. The *Pinchuk rescaling sequence* associated to $\{p_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is then the sequence of complex linear maps

$$\sigma_j := \Lambda_j \circ \psi_j : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{C}^N$$

Now assume that $\{p_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is an automorphism orbit, that is, $p_j = \phi_j(p_0)$ for some $p_0 \in \Omega$ and $\phi_j \in Aut(\Omega)$. Let

$$\omega_j = \sigma_j \circ \phi_j : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^N$$

be the resulting sequence of biholomorphisms.

One then has the following

Proposition 2.10. *In the above set-up, and in particular under the assumption that the initial domain Ω is locally convex at the smooth boundary point q, the following hold:*

(1) A subsequence of $\{\omega_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ converges uniformly on compact subsets to a holomorphic embedding $\hat{\omega} : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^N$.

(2) For the above subsequence $\omega_j(\Omega)$ converges, in the local Hausdorff topology, to $\hat{\omega}(\Omega)$.

(3) Let p be a smooth boundary point with an interior sphere contact (as in Lemma 2.8) . Then the 1-dimensional slices

$$\Sigma_j = \{z \in \Omega \ : \ z - q_j = \lambda(p_j - q_j)\}$$

converge in the local Hausdorff topology to the upper-half plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^N \ : \ Re(z_n) \geq 0\}$. In particular the map $z \mapsto z + te_n$ is an automorphism of $\hat{\omega}(\Omega)$ for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

For the proof, we refer to §4 of [KK03] and §2 of [Kim04] (see also [KK08]).

3. Strictly convex case: Proof of Corollary 1.2

Recall that $\mathcal{T}$ is the Teichmüller space of a closed surface of genus $g \geq 2$, and $\pi : \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{M}_g$ the projection to moduli space.

Assume $\mathcal{T}$ is biholomorphic to a bounded, strictly convex domain Ω in $\mathbb{C}^N$, where $N = 3g - 3$; the goal of this section is to reach a contradiction, thereby proving Corollary 1.2.

The reason for proving the corollary of the main result first is for the convenience of exposition; it is easy to verify that for any smooth boundary point in a strictly convex domain, the hypotheses in Theorem 1.1 hold. The ideas of the proof shall be generalized in §4 to complete the proof of the main result.

Boundary accumulation point. We first prove that under the above assumptions on Ω, any smooth boundary point is an accumulation of "thick" points in Teichmüller space, that is,

Proposition 3.1. *Fix a compact set $K \subset \mathcal{M}_g$. For any $p \in \partial\Omega$, there is a sequence of points $\{p_n\}_{n\geq 1} \subset \Omega$ such that*

- *$p_n \to p$ in the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{C}^N$, and*
- *p_n projects to the compact set K in $\mathcal{M}_g$.*

The following definition will be useful:

Definition 3.2 (Height function)**.** Let $p \in \partial\Omega$, with a supporting hyperplane V_p. We define the *height* $h_p(q)$ of any point $q \in \Omega$ to be the Euclidean distance between q and V_p. Equivalently, if $\nu \in (V_p - p)^\perp \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ is a unit normal to V_p pointing into Ω, then

$$h_p(q) := \langle q - p, \nu \rangle.$$

This defines a pluriharmonic function $h_p : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+$.

The following elementary observation will be used repeatedly in the paper:

Lemma 3.3 (Nesting lemma)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain such that $p \in \partial\Omega$ admits a supporting hyperplane V such that $C = V \cap \partial\Omega$ is convex. Then the closures of the sub-level sets of the height function, namely*

$$\overline{\Omega}_{\leq\delta} = \{q \in \overline{\Omega} \ : \ h_p(q) \leq \delta\}$$

converge in the Hausdorff topology to C as $\delta \to 0$.

In particular, if we assume that

- *$\Omega \subset \{x_n > 0\}$, and $p = 0 \in \partial\Omega$,*
- *the supporting hyperplane is $V = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ x_n = 0\}$, and*
- *C is the closure of an open subset of the subspace*

$$W = span\{e_j \ : \ 1 \leq j \leq k\},$$

then for any sequence of points $q_i = (x_i^1, x_i^2, \ldots, x_i^n) \in \Omega$ such that $x_i^n \to 0$, we have $x_i^j \to 0$ for $k+1 \leq j \leq n$, as $i \to \infty$.

Proof. We just have to check that given $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $\overline{\Omega}_{\leq\delta} \subset N_\epsilon(S)$ for all $\delta < \delta_0$, where $N_\epsilon(C)$ denotes the ϵ neighborhood of C.

If not, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a sequence $q_i \in \overline{\Omega}_{\leq\delta_i} \setminus N_\epsilon(C)$ where $\delta_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$.

Since $\delta_i \to 0$, after passing to a subsequence, $\{q_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ converges to a point $q \in C = V \cap \partial\Omega$. Hence, for i large enough, $q_i \in N_\epsilon(C)$, which is a contradiction. □

Corollary 3.4. *Let Ω be a strictly convex domain and let $p \in \partial\Omega$. Then the sub-level sets for the height function $\overline{\Omega}_{\leq\delta}$ converge in the Hausdorff topology to the singleton set $\{p\}$ as $\delta \to 0$.*

The first step towards Proposition 3.1 is to prove:

Proposition 3.5. *Let U be a Euclidean ball centered at $p \in \partial U$. Then there exists a complex geodesic $\phi : \Delta \to \Omega$ and a set of radial directions $E \subset S^1$ of positive measure such that any radial geodesic ray γ_θ for $\theta \in E$ is*

1. *dense in $\mathcal{M}_g$, and*
2. *eventually contained in $U \cap \Omega$.*

Proof. Let $h = h_p : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the pluriharmonic height function based on $p \in \partial\Omega$ as in Definition 3.2.

By Corollary 3.4, we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $\Omega_{\leq\delta} \subset U$. Pick a point $q \in \Omega_{\leq\frac{\delta}{2}}$.

Then by Proposition 2.3 there exists a complex geodesic $\phi : \Delta \to \Omega$ with $\phi(0) = q$ such that the set Ξ of radial directions of $T_q\mathcal{T}$ that yield dense Teichmüller rays is of full measure.

The map

$$F : \Delta \to \mathbb{R}_+$$

defined by

$$F(z) = h \circ \phi(z) - \delta \tag{4}$$

is then a harmonic function defined in the interior of the unit disk.

By the boundedness of F, we can apply Theorem 11.30(b) of [Rud87] with $p = \infty$ to conclude that it arises from a Poisson integral of a unique L^∞ function $f : S^1 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ on the boundary.

Namely, for any $z = re^{i\theta} \in \Delta$, we have

$$F(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} P_r(\theta - t) f(t) dt$$

where P_r is the Poisson kernel

$$P_r(\theta - t) = \Re\left(\frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z}\right) = \frac{1 - r^2}{1 - 2r\cos\theta - t + r^2} \tag{5}$$

By Theorem 11.23 of [Rud87], the function F has radial limits in almost every direction, that converge to the boundary function f. That is,

$$\lim_{r \to 1} F(re^{i\theta}) = f(\theta) \tag{6}$$

for almost every $\theta \in S^1$. We denote the radial ray at angle θ by γ_θ.

By the positivity of the Poisson kernel (5) , if $f(\theta) \geq 0$ for almost every $\theta \in S^1$, then $F(z) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \Delta$, which would contradict the assumption that $\phi(0) \in \Omega_{\leq\frac{\delta}{2}}$, i.e. , $F(0) \leq -\frac{\delta}{2}$.

Hence there is a positive measure set $E_0 \subset S^1$ such that $f(\theta) < 0$ for any $\theta \in E$.

Let $\theta \in E_0$. By (6) it follows that $F(re^{i\theta}) < 0$ for all r sufficiently close to 1. By the definition of F in (4) this implies that $\phi(\gamma_\theta)$ is eventually contained in U.

Now let $E = E_0 \cap \Xi$, where Ξ is the subset of dense directions introduced above. Since Ξ has full measure, the set E still has positive measure, and for any $\theta \in E$, the radial geodesic ray $\phi(\gamma_\theta)$ satisfies (1) and (2). □

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Choose a sequence of neighborhoods $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ around p that shrink to p. It suffices to show that there is a point $p_n \in U_n$ for each n, that projects the fixed compact set K in $\mathcal{M}_g$.

Fix an $n \geq 1$. Let $\phi : \Delta \to \Omega$ be the complex geodesic obtained in Proposition 3.5 (with $U := U_n$).

By Proposition 3.5, there is a radial direction such that

- the corresponding Teichmüller geodesic ray projects to a dense set in $\mathcal{M}_g$, and in particular, recurs to the compact set K, and
- which is also eventually contained in U_n.

Hence there is such a point $p_n \in U_n$ lying along the ray (and in fact infinitely many of them) that projects to the compact set K. □

Orbit accumulation points. As an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.1 we then have:

Proposition 3.6 (Shadowing orbit)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ be a bounded strictly convex domain that is biholomorphic to the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$. For any boundary $p \in \partial\Omega$, there is a point $x \in \Omega$ such that the orbit of p under the mapping class group action has p as an accumulation point.*

Proof. Fix a compact set K in $\mathcal{M}_g$, that lifts to a $MCG(S)$-equivariant collection of compact sets in Ω. By Proposition 3.1 there is a sequence of points $\{p_n\} \subset \Omega$ converging to p, such that the projection of p_n to $\mathcal{M}_g$ lies in K. Since $\mathrm{MCG}(S) = \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ there exist automorphisms γ_n of Ω such that $x_n := \gamma_n(p_n)$ lie in the fixed compact set $K \subset \Omega$. We extract a convergent subsequence $x_n \to x \in K$ and claim that $\gamma_n^{-1}(x) \to p$. This essentially follows from two facts: on any bounded domain, the Euclidean distance d^e is bounded above by the Kobayashi distance d^K (see (3) of Proposition 2.4) and the two distances induce the same topology:

$$d^e(\gamma_n^{-1}(x), \gamma_n^{-1}(x_n)) \leq C d^K(\gamma_n^{-1}(x), \gamma_n^{-1}(x_n)) = C d^K(x_n, x) \to 0$$

where C is a constant as in Proposition 2.4, and the last equality follows from the fact that any biholomorphic automorphism is also an isometry of Ω in the Kobayashi metric. Hence we have:

$$d^e(\gamma_n^{-1}(x), p) \leq d^e(\gamma_n^{-1}(x), \gamma_n^{-1}(x_n)) + d^e(\gamma_n^{-1}(x_n), p) \to 0.$$

which proves the claim. □

Finishing the proof. Recall that we have assumed $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{3g-3}$ is a bounded strictly convex domain that is biholomorphic to the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$.

Also note that Royden's theorem (see Corollary 2.5) asserts that the group of biholomorphic automorphisms of $\mathcal{T}$ is the mapping class group of the surface $MCG(S)$, which is a discrete group.

We choose a smooth boundary point $p \in \partial\Omega$ (such a point exists by Alexandroff's theorem - see §2.3).

By Proposition 3.6 the boundary point p is an accumulation point of a mapping class group orbit of some point $q \in \Omega$. In particular, there is a sequence of biholomorphic automorphisms $\phi_j : \Omega \to \Omega$ such that $\phi_j(q) \to p$ (in the Euclidean metric) as $j \to \infty$.

We then obtain a sequence of rescalings as in §2.4. Applying Proposition 2.10, we then obtain a domain biholomorphic to $\mathcal{T}$ that has a *continuous* family of automorphisms, which contradicts Royden's theorem (Corollary 2.5).

This completes the proof of Corollary 1.2.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a bounded domain biholomorphic to a Teichmuller space $\mathcal{T}$ and let $p \in \partial\Omega$. Assume that Ω has a supporting hyperplane V at p. Our main assumption is that

$$\mathcal{O} = V \cap \partial\Omega \text{ is convex and does not contain any holomorphic disk,}$$

where the latter follows from the assumption of p being a complex extreme point.

As in the strictly convex case, the goal is to prove that

$$p \text{ is an orbit accumulation point.}$$

This we accomplish in §4.3, following the strategy of the strictly-convex case dealt with in §3. For that, we define a pluriharmonic function f in §4.2 that will be the analogue of the "height" function we used in §3. The transformation of the domain Ω to a standard form in §4.1 assists in writing down an expression for f as we do in (12). Using the proof of the above fact, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in §4.4, where we use the additional assumption of local convexity at p.

4.1. **Transforming Ω to a standard form.** Without loss of generality we shall assume that $p = 0$ and $\Omega \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N \ : \ Im(z_N) > 0\}$ with supporting hyperplane

$$V = \mathbb{R}^{2N-1} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N \ : \ Im(z_N) = 0\}$$

with maximal complex subspace

$$H = \mathbb{C}^{N-1} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N \ : z_N = 0\}.$$

By the assumption, the intersection

$$\mathcal{O} = \partial\Omega \cap V$$

is a convex set and hence is the closure of an open subset of a subspace $W \subset V$. The first observation in this subsection is that after modifying the domain by a biholomorphism we can in fact assume that $W \subset H$:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a bounded domain with a smooth boundary point $0 \in \partial\Omega$, as in the set up above. Then there is a bounded domain $\Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ and a biholomorphism*

$$F : \Omega \to \Omega_1 \tag{7}$$

such that

(1) F extends holomorphically to an open neighbourhood of Ω and $F(0) = 0$.

(2) $\Omega_1 \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N \ : \ Im(z_N) > 0\}$. Hence V continues to be a supporting hyperplane for Ω_1.

(3) $\partial\Omega_1 \cap V$ is a convex subset of H.

Proof. Recall that the Cayley transform $\mathcal{C}(z) = i(\frac{z_n - i}{z_n + i} + 1))$ is a homeomorphism from the closure of the upper half-plane to the closure of a disk of radius 1 and center i, with $\mathcal{C}(0) = 0$, that is a biholomorphism in the interior.

Define $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^N$ by

$$F(z) = (z_1, ..., z_{n-1}, \mathcal{C}(z_n)).$$

It is clear that F satisfies (1). Let $\Omega_1 = F(\Omega)$, then Ω_1 satisfies (2).

As for (3), let $q = (\tilde{q}, q_n) \in \mathcal{O} = \partial\Omega_1 \cap V$. Then it is clear from the form of F that $Im(q_n) = 0$ implies $q = 0$. Hence

$$\partial\Omega_1 \cap V = \partial\Omega_1 \cap H.$$

Moreover, $F|_H$ is the identity map and we have

$$\partial\Omega_1 \cap H = F(\partial\Omega) \cap F(H) = F(\partial\Omega \cap H) = \partial\Omega \cap H.$$

The above equalities also show that $\partial\Omega_1 \cap H$ is convex as $\partial\Omega \cap H$ is convex. □

Remark/Notation. We will denote the new domain Ω_1 by Ω for notational simplicity. Note that as a consequence of (3) above, we have that $W \subset H$.

Our analysis now splits into two cases:

Case 1: The boundary point $p = 0 \in \partial\Omega$ is an interior point of $\mathcal{O} \subset W$ (in the topology of W). Note that from the assumption of p being a complex extreme point, it follows that W does not contain any complex subspace of positive dimension, i.e., W is *totally real*. This can be considered a special case of the following Case 2 (with $k = 0$ in (9)) and is thus subsumed in the subsequent discussion.

Case 2: The boundary point 0 lies in the boundary of $\mathcal{O} \subset W$.

In this case, let $V_1 \subset W$ be a supporting hyperplane for $\mathcal{O}$ at 0. We define $\mathcal{O}_1 = \partial\mathcal{O} \cap V_1$ where $\mathcal{O}_1$ is the closure of an open convex set in a subspace $W_1 \subset V_1$.

Again, we have two possibilities:

- 0 belongs to the interior of $\mathcal{O}_1$, in which case note that W_1 is totally real by the assumption of p being a complex extreme point.
- 0 belongs to the boundary $\partial\mathcal{O}_1$.

In the case of the latter possibility we again choose a supporting hyperplane $V_2 \subset W_1$ for $\mathcal{O}_1$ at 0 and we continue the above process as long as we can. Note that it terminates when either

a. 0 lies in the interior of an open set $U \subset W_k$, where $W_k \neq \{0\}$ is a nontrivial totally real subspace (again a consequence of 0 being a complex extreme point), or
b. $W_k = \{0\}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq 2N-2$.

In either case, we obtain a finite sequence of nested supporting hyperplanes

$$0 \in V_k \subset V_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset V_1 \subset V \tag{8}$$

and corresponding subspaces:

$$0 \in W_k \subset W_{k-1} \subset \cdots \subset W_1 \subset W_0 = W \tag{9}$$

where W_k is a totally real subspace of dimension j (possibly equal to zero).

By construction, each subspace W_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$ corresponds to the span of vectors lying in $\mathcal{O}_i = \partial\mathcal{O} \cap V_i$ where V_i is a supporting hyperplane of $\mathcal{O}_{i-1}$. (Here $\mathcal{O}_0 = \mathcal{O}$ is the original intersection of the supporting hyperplane $V_0 = V$ with $\partial\Omega$.)

If $j := dim(W_k) > 0$, we transform the domain Ω to a standard form by an invertible complex linear map as in the following lemma. In what follows, we identify $GL(N,\mathbb{C})$ with $\{T \in GL(2N,\mathbb{R}) \ : \ TJ = JT\}$ where J is the standard almost-complex structure.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $W \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a nontrivial totally real subspace such that*

$$span\{e_{2N}, Je_{2N}\} \cap W = \{0\}.$$

If $dim(W) = j$ then there exists $L \in GL(N,\mathbb{C})$ such that

- $L(e_{2N}) = e_{2N}$ *and*
- $L(W) = span\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_j\}$.

Proof. Let $W_1 = W + J(W)$ and let V be the complementary J-invariant subspace containing $\{e_{2N}, Je_{2N}\}$. Namely, take $V = (span\{e_{2N}, Je_{2N}\} + W_1)^{\perp} + span\{e_{2N}, Je_{2N}\}$. Choose a basis $\{v_1, ..., v_k\}$ of W and define $L : \mathbb{R}^{2N} \to \mathbb{R}^{2N}$ by $L(v_i) = e_{2i-1}$, $L(Jv_i) = e_{2i} = Je_{2i-1}$, $i = 1, ..., j$ and $L(v) = v$ for all $v \in V$.

By construction, the linear map L commutes with J, that is, we have $JL = LJ$. Since L is invertible, we have $L \in GL(N, \mathbb{C})$. □

We now postcompose the transformation (7) with the above linear biholomorphism

$$L : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2 \tag{10}$$

The composition

$$T = L \circ F : \Omega \to \Omega_2 \tag{11}$$

is a biholomorphic transformation.

As in the previous case, we shall continue to call the transformed domain by Ω, instead of Ω_2 for notational simplicity.

Since the image of convex sets under the linear transformation L remain convex, and supporting hyperplanes remain supporting, the assumptions on the convexity of the intersections of boundaries and supporting hyperplanes continue to hold. The previous iterative construction continues to give a nested sequence (9). That is, we have convex sets $\mathcal{O}_k \subset \mathcal{O}_{k-1} \subset \cdots \mathcal{O}_1 \subset \mathcal{O}$ obtained in successive intersections with supporting hyperplanes as in (8) and corresponding subspaces $\{W_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ as in (9), such that now the last subspace W_k is in the standard form $L(W)$ has in the above lemma.

4.2. **Pluriharmonic function f.** As in the strictly convex case, we now define a pluriharmonic function that will serve as the substitute for the height function in Definition 3.2:

In what follows ν_i will denote the unit inward-pointing normal vector to the supporting hyperplane V_i at $0 \in \partial\Omega_{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ (see (8)).

For $c_0, ..., c_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$, define $f : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ to be the pluriharmonic function

$$f(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} c_i \langle z, \nu_i \rangle + (x_1^2 - y_1^2) + ... + (x_j^2 - y_j^2) \tag{12}$$

for any $z \in \Omega$, where, for each $1 \leq l \leq j$, $z_l = x_l + iy_l$ is the l-th coordinate.

(Note that in the strictly convex case $W_0 = \{0\}$ and the above expression reduces to $f(z) = c_0 \langle z, \nu \rangle$ which is the usual height function up to the multiplicative factor.)

The following technical lemma will be useful in determining the coefficients in (12) which we shall do later in this section.

For a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we say that a function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ is *uniformly positive* if there exists $C > 0$ such that $f(x) \geq C$ for all $x \in S$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded set. Suppose that $0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $\Omega \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ x_n > 0\}$. Further, if $V = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ x_n = 0\}$, assume that $\partial\Omega \cap V$ is convex, and the closure of an open subset of $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ x_{j+1} = ... = x_n = 0\}$. Let*

$g : \mathbb{R}^{n-j} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function with $g(0) = 0$. Then, given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that the function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f(x) = Cx_n + \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i^2 + g(x_{j+1}, ..., x_n) \tag{13}$$

is uniformly positive on $\Omega \setminus B(0, \sqrt{n}\epsilon)$.

Proof. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n-j}$ be the projection

$$\pi(x) = (x_{j+1}, ..., x_n).$$

By the continuity of g at 0 we can find $\eta > 0$ so that

$$|g(\pi(x))| < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \tag{14}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|\pi(x)| < \eta$. Also, by Lemma 3.3, we can choose $\delta > 0$ small enough such that

$$x \in \Omega_{\leq \delta} \implies |\pi(x)| < \eta \tag{15}$$

where $\Omega_{\leq \delta}$ is a sub-level set of the height function as in Lemma 3.3.

Here we can assume that

$$\eta < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \delta < \min\{1, \epsilon\}. \tag{16}$$

Let $\Omega_{\geq h} = \{x \in \Omega : x_n \geq h\}$. In what follows, we shall choose a value of $C > 0$ in (13) such that

$$f(x) \geq C\delta^2 \tag{17}$$

if either (A) or (B) below hold:

(A) $x \in \Omega_{<\delta}$ and $|x_{j_0}| \geq \epsilon$ for some $1 \leq j_0 \leq j$,
(B) $x \in \Omega_{\geq \delta}$.

We first consider (A): by (14) and (15) we have $g(\pi(x)) > -\epsilon^2/2$ and hence

$$f(x) = Cx_n + \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i^2 + g(\pi(x)) \geq \epsilon^2/2$$

since $\sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i^2 \geq \epsilon^2$ as part of the assumption in (A).

Therefore to satisfy (17) it would suffice to choose C such that

$$\epsilon^2/2 \geq C\delta^2. \tag{18}$$

For the second condition (B), let

$$-\alpha = \inf_{x \in \Omega} \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i^2 + g(\pi(x)) \Big). \tag{19}$$

Then we have

$$f(x) \geq C\delta - \alpha$$

for all $x \in \Omega_{\geq \delta}$.

To satisfy (17), we need to have $C\delta - \alpha \geq C\delta^2$ in addition to (18).

That is, we need

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\delta^2} \geq C \geq \frac{\alpha}{\delta - \delta^2}$$

But for small enough δ, we have that

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} > \frac{\alpha\delta}{1-\delta}$$

which implies

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\delta^2} > \frac{\alpha}{\delta - \delta^2}$$

and we can find such a required C.

Thus by construction, for this choice of C, the function f satisfies (17) and is uniformly positive whenever (A) or (B) holds. However, if both (A) and (B) fail to hold, then $x \in \Omega_{<\delta}$ and $|x_i| \leq \epsilon$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j$. Then by (15) and (16), we see that $|x| < \sqrt{n}\epsilon$. □

We now return to the pluriharmonic function f:

Lemma 4.4. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a choice of positive real constants $\{c_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq k}$ in the expression (12) such that f is uniformly positive on $\Omega \backslash B(0, \sqrt{2N}\epsilon)$.*

Proof. Recall that the previous construction gave a nested sequence of subspaces (9) spanned by intersections of supporting hyperplanes to boundary flats containing the boundary point 0. The proof is inductive, based on the number of subspaces in the above nested sequence.

Special case ($k = 0$):

Consider first the case when 0 lies in the interior of the boundary flat $\mathcal{O} \subset W$, and W is a totally real subspace of dimension $j \geq 1$. That is, $k = 0$ in the above iterative construction, and the expression (12) reduces to

$$f(z) = Cy_N + (x_1^2 - y_1^2) + ... + (x_j^2 - y_j^2) \tag{20}$$

for any $z \in \Omega$, where $\langle z, \nu \rangle = y_N$ is the height from the supporting hyperplane, and C is a positive real constant that is to be chosen. An application of Lemma 4.3, which can be applied after suitably reordering the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{2N}$ so that $e_{2i} \mapsto e_{j+i}$ for $i = 1, ..., j$, with $g(x_{j+1}, ..., x_{2N}) = -\sum_{i=j+1}^{2j} x_i^2$ then gives the required C.

General case ($k \geq 1$):



FIGURE 1. A schematic representation of $\mathcal{O}_{l-1}$ and its various subsets in the inductive step in the proof of Lemma 4.4.

In general, when the pluriharmonic function has the expression (12) with $k \geq 1$, we use an inductive argument to choose the coefficients.

We begin by applying Lemma 4.3 with Ω substituted by $\mathcal{O}_{k-1}$ to show that one can choose the coefficient c_k such that the function

$$f_k(z) := c_k\langle z, \nu_k\rangle + (x_1^2 - y_1^2) + ... + (x_j^2 - y_j^2)$$

is uniformly positive on $\mathcal{O}_{k-1} \setminus B_{k-1}$. Here $B_{k-1} \subset \mathcal{O}_{k-1}$ is the ball of radius $\sqrt{a_{k-1}}\epsilon$ centered at 0, where $a_{k-1} = dim(W_{k-1})$.

We define c_l, $0 \leq l \leq k-1$, inductively as follows. Assume that c_{l+1} has been chosen so that the function

$$f_{l+1}(z) := \sum_{i=l+1}^{k} c_i\langle z, \nu_i\rangle + (x_1^2 - y_1^2) + ... + (x_j^2 - y_j^2)$$

is uniformly positive on $\mathcal{O}_l \setminus B_l$ for some neighborhood B_l of the boundary point 0 in the supporting hyperplane V_l.

Let

$$b_l = \inf\{f_{l+1}(z) \ : \ z \in \mathcal{O}_{l-1}\}.$$

Note that the restrictions of f_l and f_{l+1} to $\mathcal{O}_l$ coincide. Hence by the inductive hypothesis and the continuity of f_l on $\mathcal{O}_{l-1}$, there is a $\delta_{l-1} > 0$ so that f_l is uniformly positive on $(\mathcal{O}_{l-1})_{<\delta_{l-1}} \setminus B^{cyl}_{l-1}$, where B^{cyl}_{l-1} is the set of points in $\mathcal{O}_{l-1}$ whose projection to the supporting hyperplane V_l lies in B_l.

Here $(\mathcal{O}_{l-1})_{<\delta}$ (resp. $(\mathcal{O}_{l-1})_{>\delta}$) is the set of points $z \in \mathcal{O}_{l-1}$ such that the height $\langle z, \nu_l \rangle$ from the supporting hyperplane V_l is less (resp. greater than) δ. (See Figure 1.)

Moreover, we can choose the δ_{l-1} to be small enough such that B^{cyl}_{l-1} lies within the neighborhood $B(0, \sqrt{2N}\epsilon)$ of the boundary point.

Now we pick any c_l with

$$c_l \geq \frac{1 - b_l}{\delta_{l-1}}.$$

This will ensure that

$$f_l(z) := c_l \langle z, \nu_l \rangle + f_{l+1}(z) \geq 1$$

if $z \in (\mathcal{O}_{l-1})_{\geq \delta_{l-1}}$.

Note that $(\mathcal{O}_{l-1})_{<\delta_{l-1}} \cap B^{cyl}_{l-1}$ is contained in a neighborhood B_{l-1} of the boundary point.

Together, we now have that f_l is uniformly positive on $\mathcal{O}_{l-1} \setminus B_{l-1}$, which completes the inductive step. □

4.3. **Existence of orbit accumulation points.** To use the same strategy as in §2, we first prove:

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is an $\eta > 0$ such that there is a complex geodesic $\phi : \Delta \to \Omega$ with $\phi(0) = (0, i\eta) \in \mathbb{C}^{N-1} \times \mathbb{C}$ with a positive measure worth of radial directions that yield Teichmüller rays that are dense, and eventually lie in an $\sqrt{2N}\epsilon$-ball around 0.*

Proof. Once we have the analogue of the height function, the rest of the proof is identical to that of Proposition 3.5: Namely, consider the pluriharmonic function f defined by the expression (12) with the coefficients chosen by Lemma 4.4 such that it is uniformly positive outside the neighborhood $B(0, \sqrt{2N}\epsilon)$ of the boundary point 0. In fact, the proof of Lemma 4.4 shows that we can pick C such that there exists a $0 < \delta \leq \min\{1, \epsilon\}$ such that $f(z) \geq C\delta^2$ for any $z \in \Omega \setminus B(0, \sqrt{2N}\epsilon)$ (see (17)).

Now choose a point $q \in \Omega_{<\sqrt{\delta}} \cap B(0, \epsilon)$. In particular, note that $q = (0, i\eta)$ lies in such a set, for sufficiently small $\eta > 0$. By Proposition 2.3 there exists a complex geodesic

$$\phi : \Delta \to \Omega$$

with $\phi(0) = q$ such that the set Ξ of radial directions of $T_q\mathcal{T}$ that yield dense Teichmüller rays is of full measure.

Consider the harmonic function

$$F(z) = f \circ \phi(z) : \Delta \to \mathbb{R}_+ \tag{21}$$

Since $q \in \Omega_{<\sqrt{\delta}} \cap B(0, \epsilon)$, neither (A) or (B) for (17) holds, and we have that

$$F(0) = f \circ \phi(0) = f(q) < C\delta^2 \tag{22}$$

As observed above, if almost all the radial limits of ϕ were outside the $\sqrt{2N}\epsilon$-neighborhood of 0, then by (17) almost all the radial limits of F would be greater than $C\delta^2$. Since F is harmonic, the Poisson formula would then contradict the inequality (22).

Hence there is a positive measure set of directions such that the radial rays in $\phi(\Delta)$ are eventually contained in the $\sqrt{2N}\epsilon$-radius ball around 0; intersecting with the full measure set Ξ of dense directions gives the desired set. □

We can now finally conclude:

Proposition 4.6. *The boundary point $0 \in \partial\Omega$ is an orbit accumulation point.*

Proof. As in §3.1 we first prove the weaker statement that there is a sequence of points $x_n \in \Omega$ that project to a fixed compact set K in $\mathcal{M}_g$, and converge to the boundary point $0 \in \partial\Omega$ as $n \to \infty$: this is exactly as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, where we use Proposition 4.5 instead of Proposition 3.5.

To show that 0 is in fact an accumulation point of an orbit of a single point, the proof of Proposition 3.6 (Shadowing orbit) can be used verbatim. □

4.4. **Completing the proof of Theorem 1.1.** Recall that the domain Ω in the preceding sections is in fact the domain Ω_2 in (11) that is obtained by a biholomorphic transformation T of the original domain.

We shall now use the assumption that the original domain was in fact locally convex at the smooth boundary point 0.

By Proposition 4.6, there is an orbit of automorphisms accumulating to the point 0 in the boundary of the transformed domain Ω_2. Now we note that the biholomorphism T extends continuously to a homeomorphism of boundaries. This is clear since T is a composition of the Cayley transform map of Lemma 4.1 and a linear transformation. Hence, applying T^{-1}, we obtain an orbit accumulating to the point 0 in the boundary of the original domain Ω.

Consider the Kim-Krantz-Pinchuk rescalings of §3.1 for this converging sequence orbit points. Since the domain is locally convex at this smooth accumulation point, we can apply Proposition 2.10, and obtain a domain biholomorphic to $\mathcal{T}$ that has a *continuous* family of automorphisms. This contradicts Royden's theorem (Corollary 2.5), and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

5. Smooth boundary: Proof of Theorem 1.3

In this section let Ω be a smooth C^2-bounded domain. Theorem 1.3 asserts that a finite-dimensional Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}$ cannot be biholomorphic to Ω.

This has been observed earlier (see pg. 328 of [Yau11]); here we give a simpler proof based on the considerations in this paper.

We begin by recalling the following well-known elementary fact from differential geometry:

Lemma 5.1. *For any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ with C^2-smooth boundary, there exists a point $p \in \partial\Omega$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. Consider a point $p \in \overline{\Omega}$ that realizes the largest distance from the origin $sup\{|x| \ : \ x \in \overline{\Omega}\} = d$. We claim that p satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.1. It is clear that $p \in \partial\Omega$ and and that $\Omega \subset B(0,d)$. Moreover, $\overline{\Omega}$ and $\partial B(0,d)$ intersect at p where they share a common tangent space. To see the local strict convexity, let $\rho : \mathbb{C}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be a C^2-smooth defining function for Ω, i.e., $\rho^{-1}(-\infty, 0) = \Omega$, $\rho^{-1}(0) = \partial\Omega$ and $\nabla\rho(p) \neq 0$ for every $p \in \partial\Omega$. It is then enough to show that the Hessian of ρ at p restricted to $T_p(\partial\Omega)$ is positive definite, which the following calculation shows:

Let $v \in T_p(\partial\Omega)$ and $\sigma : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \to \partial\Omega$ a C^2 curve with $\sigma(0) = p$ and $\sigma'(0) = v$. Consider $\phi := \|\sigma\|^2 : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$. Since $t = 0$ is a local minimum for ϕ, we have

$$\langle \sigma''(0), p \rangle \leq -\|v\|^2. \tag{23}$$

On the other hand, differentiating the equation $\rho \circ \sigma(t) = 1$ twice at $t = 0$ we have

$$Hess\ \rho(v,v) = -\langle \nabla\rho(p), \sigma''(0) \rangle. \tag{24}$$

Since $\nabla\rho(p) = cp$ for some $c > 0$, (23) and (24) together give $Hess\ \rho(v,v) \geq c\|v\|^2$. □

An application of Theorem 1.1 completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

References

[Ahl06] Lars V. Ahlfors, *Lectures on quasiconformal mappings*, second ed., University Lecture Series, vol. 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006, With supplemental chapters by C. J. Earle, I. Kra, M. Shishikura and J. H. Hubbard.

[Ale39] A. D. Alexandroff, *Almost everywhere existence of the second differential of a convex function and some properties of convex surfaces connected with it*, Leningrad State Univ. Annals [Uchenye Zapiski] Math. Ser. **6** (1939), 3–35. MR 0003051

[Ant14] Stergios M. Antonakoudis, *The complex geometry of Teichmuller space*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2014, Thesis (Ph.D.)–Harvard University.

[AP99] Marco Abate and Giorgio Patrizio, *Convex-like properties of the Teichmüller metric*, Complex geometric analysis in Pohang (1997), Contemp. Math., vol. 222, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 149–159.

[BCP96] Gabriele Bianchi, Andrea Colesanti, and Carlo Pucci, *On the second differentiability of convex surfaces*, Geom. Dedicata **60** (1996), no. 1, 39–48.

[Ber60] Lipman Bers, *Spaces of Riemann surfaces as bounded domains*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **66** (1960), 98–103.

[Fra89] Sidney Frankel, *Complex geometry of convex domains that cover varieties*, Acta Math. **163** (1989), no. 1-2, 109–149.

[GS13] Hervé Gaussier and Harish Seshadri, *Totally geodesic discs in strongly convex domains*, Math. Z. **274** (2013), no. 1-2, 185–197.

[Hub06] John Hamal Hubbard, *Teichmüller theory and applications to geometry, topology, and dynamics. Vol. 1*, Matrix Editions, Ithaca, NY, 2006.

[Kim04] Kang-Tae Kim, *On the automorphism groups of convex domains in* $\mathbb{C}^n$, Adv. Geom. **4** (2004), no. 1, 33–40.

[KK03] Kang-Tae Kim and Steven G. Krantz, *Some new results on domains in complex space with non-compact automorphism group*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **281** (2003), no. 2, 417–424.

[KK08] ———, *Complex scaling and geometric analysis of several variables*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. **45** (2008), no. 3, 523–561.

[Kru91] S. L. Krushkal, *Strengthening pseudoconvexity of finite-dimensional Teichmüller spaces*, Math. Ann. **290** (1991), no. 4, 681–687.

[Kru95] Samuel L. Krushkal, *Teichmüller spaces are not starlike*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **20** (1995), no. 1, 167–173.

[Leh87] Olli Lehto, *Univalent functions and Teichmüller spaces*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 109, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[Lem81] László Lempert, *La métrique de Kobayashi et la représentation des domaines sur la boule*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **109** (1981), no. 4, 427–474.

[Mar] Vlad Markovic, *Caratheodory's metric in Teichmüller spaces and L-shaped pillowcases*, Preprint.

[Mas80] Howard Masur, *Uniquely ergodic quadratic differentials*, Comment. Math. Helv. **55** (1980), no. 2, 255–266.

[Mas82] ———, *Interval exchange transformations and measured foliations*, Ann. of Math. (2) **115** (1982), no. 1, 169–200.

[McM91] Curt McMullen, *Cusps are dense*, Ann. of Math. (2) **133** (1991), no. 1, 217–247. MR 1087348

[Nik02] Nikolai Nikolov, *Localization of invariant metrics*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **79** (2002), no. 1, 67–73.

[Pin91] Sergey Pinchuk, *The scaling method and holomorphic mappings*, Several complex variables and complex geometry, Part 1 (Santa Cruz, CA, 1989), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 52, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991, pp. 151–161.

[Ros79] Jean-Pierre Rosay, *Sur une caractérisation de la boule parmi les domaines de* $\mathbf{C}^n$ *par son groupe d'automorphismes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **29** (1979), no. 4, ix, 91–97. MR 558590

[Roy71] H. L. Royden, *Automorphisms and isometries of Teichmüller space*, Advances in the Theory of Riemann Surfaces (Proc. Conf., Stony Brook, N.Y., 1969), Ann. of Math. Studies, No. 66. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1971, pp. 369–383. MR 0288254

[Rud87] Walter Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, third ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987. MR 924157

[Shi84] Hiroshige Shiga, *On analytic and geometric properties of Teichmüller spaces*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **24** (1984), no. 3, 441–452.

[Siu91] Yum Tong Siu, *Uniformization in several complex variables*, Contemporary geometry, Univ. Ser. Math., Plenum, New York, 1991, pp. 95–130.

[Vee82] William A. Veech, *Gauss measures for transformations on the space of interval exchange maps*, Ann. of Math. (2) **115** (1982), no. 1, 201–242.

[Won77] B. Wong, *Characterization of the unit ball in* $\mathbf{C}^n$ *by its automorphism group*, Invent. Math. **41** (1977), no. 3, 253–257.

[Yau11] Shing-Tung Yau, *A survey of geometric structure in geometric analysis*, Surveys in differential geometry. Volume XVI. Geometry of special holonomy and related topics, Surv. Differ. Geom., vol. 16, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2011, pp. 325–347.

[Yeu03] Sai-Kee Yeung, *Bounded smooth strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions on Teichmüller spaces*, Math. Res. Lett. **10** (2003), no. 2-3, 391–400.

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560012, India.

E-mail address: subhojoy@math.iisc.ernet.in

E-mail address: harish@math.iisc.ernet.in